How LBJ's Comeback May Help Nixon, P. 2

The Whole Truth About The Arms Race In One Easy Lesson

"Based on our military outlays and economic strength, if we are six feet tall, the Russians by comparison are three feet tall and the Chinese six inches."

—Sen. Proxmire *(D. Wis.)* as he released a report Dec. 27, *The Military Budget and National Priorities*, proposing a $10 billion cut next year in Pentagon spending.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVIII, NO. 1 JANUARY 12, 1970 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Heading for A Bigger Arms Race in the 70's

Despite euphoric reports about the SALT talks and the $5.9 billion cut in the final defense budget this fiscal year, the military monster is far from being subdued. It takes a long time before cuts in Congressional authorization and appropriation bills actually lead to cuts in expenditure. The best guide to actual expenditures is the daily U.S. Treasury statement. Its Jan. 2 statement covering all but the last two days of the first half of the 1970 fiscal year is not encouraging. The cash deficit for the six months was $12.4 billion as against $7.8 billion in the same period last year. To this deficit the military establishment was a prime contributor, despite the first withdrawals from Vietnam and talk of reduced commitments. In the first half of the fiscal year the military drew more than half a billion ($685 million) *more* from the Treasury than in the corresponding period a year ago. The *rate* of increase seemed to be going up. In December alone military spending was more than $1 billion higher than in December a year ago. The tempo of military spending is still feeding the fires of inflation.

Four Trillion on Arms Since 1900

The Tax Foundation estimates that in 1970 the average tax burden per American family for defense will be $1,250 a year. For those families lucky enough to be on the gravy train of the military-industrial complex, this tax is easily outweighed by their earnings. Indeed from an economic point of view the arms race is a device for taxing the poor to the profit of the well-to-do. The prospect for a change in the 70s is dim. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency estimates that the world has spent $4,000 billion on arms since 1900 and at the current rate of increase will spend that much again in the coming decade alone. That, too, will not help our chronic inflationary fevers.

There is little reason to believe that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) will change the picture much, if at all. The two biggest escalations which lie ahead are those to be sparked by MIRV, the multiple independently targeted missile warheads, and the ABM, the anti-ballistic missile. There is no sign that Washington or Moscow is prepared to halt either. The constant and pleased assurances from the State Department and the Pentagon that the Russians at Helsinki were behaving splendidly and avoiding "propaganda" are—in our opinion—cause for depression, not optimism. If Moscow were militantly for disarmament or arms control, we may be sure this would be stigmatized as "propaganda."

Defense Cutbacks Through Air Force Eyes

The authorization bill gives almost no solace to the more vociferous foes of military spending. In general, the Defense Department seems certain to get approval for all the weapons systems and most of the research and development it considers most critical . . . Senator Stennis, chairman of Senate Armed Services Committee, has said the new authorization bill has not skipped a major weapon system or even put severe restrictions on any of them. "The bone and muscle are still there," the Senator declared . . . Cutting the first $1.5 billion was the easy part of the job. After all, USAF had already dropped the Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL) program, and the Army had cancelled its ill-fated Cheyenne helicopter and started to redeploy troops from Vietnam. The Navy sailed some of its ships into mothballs, headed by the battleship New Jersey, which had proved an expensive platform for lobbing 16-inch shells at the Vietcong . . . So far as the impact on industry is concerned, the requirement for new hardware to fill the void stands firm.

—Defense Cutbacks in *Air Force/Space Digest*, organ of the Air Force Association, Dec. 1969.

Disarmament buffs had naively assumed that a main purpose of the SALT talks was to block MIRV, for once the missiles on both sides are outfitted with the multiple warheads, it will be impossible for either side to know by aerial surveillance how many warheads there are atop each missile on the other. The fog and the fear will come down again, and it will be hard to keep the arms race within any bounds at all. But the Pentagon is now leaking the revelation that there has never been much if any intention on our side to curb MIRV. William Beecher, who covers the Pentagon for the *New York Times*, reported in a dispatch to his paper Dec. 31 that while the Johnson Administration in the summer of 1968 was prepared to propose a freeze on strategic weapons, there was to be no limitation on "improvement of systems within the limited numbers," including MIRVs. This was the first public disclosure of the Johnson negotiating position. George C. Wilson, who covers the Pentagon for the *Washington Post*, reported (Jan. 1) from a similar briefing with unnamed officials that "the Nixon Administration view is that multiple-warhead submarines are a fact of life already" so MIRV discussion would focus on the land-based missiles "but, according to informed sources, the Soviets showed little interest at the SALT talks in calling off the flight tests of MIRV missiles." Clearly the Nixon Administration shares

(Continued On Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LBJ's Comeback and The Democratic Cave-In on the War

JOHNSON SHOULD BE PAYING CBS for its interviews with him. They are self-aggrandizing commercials. They signal Johnson's well-planned return to public life. As an actor, LBJ was superb; it was like watching Lyndon Johnson playing Lionel Barrymore playing Johnson. We will not waste time or space exposing his mendacities; they have been amply set forth in press comment. It is more important to observe that, despite all the exposure of its tricky revisions of history, this debut was probably a success with the average viewer. He is no match for this old con man.

Johnson in his first TV appearance cut Humphrey's throat while praising Nixon. "Candidate Nixon," Johnson said after criticizing Humphrey for the Salt Lake City speech, "did not make any change in policy," i.e. Johnson's policy. A few days later in an interview with Laurence Stern of the *Washington Post* (Jan. 1), Humphrey said weakly, "I basically support President Nixon's policy. I believe that we will have most of our combat forces out before the end of 1970". Humphrey is scared stiff of Johnson. So are most of the Democratic politicos. This helps to account for the weak turnabout of Senator Fred Harris of the Democratic National Committee. In October he said it was "time to take the gloves off the war." But (as the sharp-eyed Mary McGrory noted) he put them back on again at a press conference two days after the Johnson TV-cast. "If you were grading him on Vietnam," was all Harris would say, "the President had an 'I' for incomplete." An anemic white paper issued by the Democratic National Committee said Nixon had "accurately gauged" the national mood on Vietnam. Johnson seems to think so, too.

Should Nixon Re-Escalate

The question is how Johnson will use his influence. I fear it will be thrown behind Nixon in the next military or political crisis in and/or over Vietnam. Nixon has threatened some form of re-escalation if enemy action upsets "Vietnamization." To send troops back would be unpopular. The easier move would be resumption in the bombing of the North, but this time aimed at the railroad lines from China and the ports, especially Haiphong. This was advocated by Goldwater in a Senate speech Dec. 18 on his return from Vietnam. Goldwater said Nixon had already "reached a fork in the Vietnam road", one leading to "a complete pullout, which he will not do", the other "to a never-ending war which neither the President nor the American people would allow." Goldwater said the problem was "to find another road", and he sees this in a resumed but no longer limited bombing campaign. This speech is a sample of the advice Nixon is getting from the right, and it is on the right that his whole political strategy is focused.

The truth is that a dead end lies ahead in which some act of desperation by Nixon is to be feared. I would not even exclude the possibility of our using "tactical" nuclear weapons, perhaps to try and close off the passes out of the North and "irradiate" a belt across the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos. Vietnam has been, like Spain before World War II, a testing ground for new weapons. Only the nuclear haven't been used, and there must be military men itching to give them a try, too—though of course, the public would be told, in "unpopulated areas only."

The Democrats, if they had the guts, would be warning the country of these dangers ahead. The so-called Nixon doctrine is only the same idea which led under Dulles to that broken reed, the SEATO pact, and the pipe-dream of letting "Asians fight Asians" for us. Nixon still wants to contain China, and to keep Vietnam as a base for that purpose. We claim to be fighting there for "self-determination" but we cannot allow a more representative government because it would make peace, opt for neutrality and invite us out.

Whatever our bombers do in the North, they cannot solve the political problem in the South. Should they hit hard enough so that Hanoi collapses, then China will step in as she did in Korea to protect her borders. A wider war, a big war, is still possible. That is the alarm bell which needs ringing.

Complete and Smashing Victory

Saigon (Reuters)—A Vietnamese legislator said today that if government figures are to be believed there are no Communists at all left in South Vietnam. Deputy Nguyen Dac Dau told a news conference—called by 16 opposition members to criticize President Thieu's administration—that according to the government the country had 300,000 Communists two years ago. "But now the government says more than 300,000 have been killed by the armed forces, another 100,000 have defected under the open-arms policy and 100,000 are in jail," he said. "So where are there Communists now?" he asked. The news conference was hastily convened after government supporters boycotted a House session called to discuss a statement last week in which Thieu accused some deputies of supporting neutralism.

—The Washington Post, Dec. 19.

How Nixon's Frontiers of Freedom Look To The World's Non-Communist Editors

Geneva—Vice President Agnew's attacks on newspapers and television were 1969's "most serious threat to the freedom of information in the Western World," the International Press Institute said today. The Zurich-based institute represents 1,600 newspaper editors in 58 non-Communist countries.

—New York Times, Jan. 1.

Zurich (Reuters)—The International Press Institute today devoted the last section of its annual review of press freedom to South Vietnam where, it said, any nominal press freedoms were a "sop to the outside world." The review said, "The bleakest prospect for press freedom is, paradoxically, in the country where a war is being waged in the name of freedom—South Vietnam. . . . Even so, the government does not hesitate to take ruthless action against the press and pressmen, and the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press is often meaningless. Numerous publications were suspended for varying periods throughout the year.

"It is impossible to draw any other conclusion than that, as the American withdrawal continues throughout 1970 and the Saigon government finds itself confronted with the military and civilian problems resultant, the position of the press in South Vietnam will deteriorate further," the review said.

—Baltimore Sun, Jan. 2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Political Miracle in That Detention Camp Repealer

THE SENATE DEC. 22 PASSED S. 1872 without opposition. This bill would repeal the detention camp provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. If it passes the House, it will rid the law books of a Fascistic piece of legislation. It would allow the government, in an "internal security emergency", to throw suspected dissidents into concentration camps if there is "reasonable ground to believe" they "probably will with others engage in acts of espionage or sabotage." Thus people could be jailed not for committing a crime but because some official thought they *might*. This is what the Nazis called preventive arrest.

A Panicky Attempt at "Compromise"

This concentration camp bill had a curious history. In the late 40s liberals and conservative lawyers alike had fought the Mundt-Nixon bill to set up a Subversive Activities Control Board as a first American experiment in thought control. With the Korean war in 1950, the anti-Communist hysteria reached a new pitch and it was all set for passage. A group of Senate liberals then made a panicky effort to block it by proposing the detention camp bill as a substitute. A few days later J. Edgar Hoover told the Senate Appropriations Committee he could seize 12,000 of "the most dangerous Communists at a moment's notice." (*Facts on File* p. 286M 1950). The right-wingers seized joyfully on the detention camp bill but instead of making it a substitute, tacked it on to he Mundt-Nixon bill and passed the whole monstrosity over Truman's veto.

The Supreme Court has since declared most of the Act unconstitutional. But the Detention Camp provisions are still on the books. Liberals and the Left have staged many campaigns against it with little effect; members of Congress are queasy about voting against anything anti-Communist. The Senate passage of the repealer is something of a miracle. The miracle happened because this time the attack came from an unexpected non-Left source. The campaign to repeal was launched in 1968 by the Japanese American Citizens League, which remembers how 110,000 Japanese Americans were thrown into detention camps (on Presidential order) after Pearl Harbor though their sons fought in the U.S. Army. They made repeal an ethnic and regional issue in Hawaii and on the West Coast. Inouye of Hawaii introduced the Senate repealer last April, and Matsunaga of Hawaii, put in a repealer in the House. They soon acquired 26 co-sponsors in the Senate, and 129 in the House, where a similar bill by Mikva of Illinois attracted 12 additional sponsors, a grand total in the House of 143.

The Inouye bill acquired some strange co-sponsors, including Mundt. This is because Eastland, in his still unsuccessful effort to get a new omnibus repressive measure (S. 12) the Internal Security Act of 1969 past the Senate, had tried to sweeten it by putting a Detention Camp repealer of his own in that bill, which Mundt supports. In the civil rights coalition, the Inouye repealer won everybody's support, except curiously the Bnai Brith's Anti-Defamation League.

The first lucky break for repeal came with the appearance in the *Atlantic Monthly* last May of an article in which Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst was quoted by Elizabeth Drew, its energetic Washington editor, as saying that "If people demonstrate in a manner to interfere with others, they should be rounded up and put in a detention camp." This provoked sour press comment and stirred an uproar in the black community.

A second unexpected break was a column by Evans and Novack Nov. 16 disclosing that the Justice Department was privately opposing the detention camp repealer. This put more heat on Kleindienst. The result was a Justice Department statement Dec. 3 by Kleindienst supporting the repealer and denying the quotation in the *Atlantic Monthly*. So it was that on Dec. 22 Majority Leader Mansfield was able to announce, "I am delighted that this long overdue bill has passed the Senate unanimously." It will be a happy New Year if it also passes the House, and readers can help by urging their Congressman to vote for repeal.

Small Mercies and Slow Poisons Dept.

The American Army has given up the manufacture of a kind of air-gun for shooting little arrows, which had been intended for dispersing demonstrators and looters. The arrows were treated with a paralyzing substance which would have prevented the person hit from moving for several minutes. After an expenditure of $48,000 on research, the project was abandoned because the targets could not be hit with sufficient accuracy and because the paralyzing substance took too long to work.

—UPI in *Le Monde* (Paris), Nov. 27.

A Quaker Report Exposes The Truth Behind Nixon's Renunciation Of Bacterial War

Biological weapons constitute less than 10 percent of the U.S. arsenal of CBW agents (the rest being chemical). Furthermore, at least part of this BW arsenal will not be covered in the ban because of a re-defining of biological toxins which was one result of U Thant's report to the U.N. General Assembly in July, 1969. That report, compiled by chemical warfare experts from all over the world, reclassified the non-reproductive toxins, which are produced by living organisms, as chemical, rather than biological, warfare agents.

It was discovered that the first chapter of the U.N. report, which included the changed definition, was written by a team headed by Dr. Ivan Bennett, Director of the New York University Medical Center, Research Contract Director of the Chemical Corps and an advisor to the Army on epidemiology and pathology. His staff included three Pentagon officials, and the first draft of Bennett's chapter was written by the Army's CBW experts, according to Representative Richard McCarthy (D. N.Y.).

In a telephone conversation with Dr. Bennett, he reported that his staff, even while in Geneva working on negotiations of the final draft, were in telephone contact with the Pentagon "every day."

Thus, far from being banned, as the President implied, the use of germs in warfare has merely been refined. We now produce a "chemical" agent extracted from live germs to induce the disease directly. This allows us to apply the disease to selected targets rather than to rely on random infection. Botulin bullets, then, could be effective assassination or counterinsurgency weapons which would need only to nick their victims to produce death by botulism, the disease induced by the powerful toxin. The President has renounced the militarily unreliable part of the U.S. biological arsenal, and has reclassified the useful part as "chemical substances."

—From a report by Nation Action/Research on the Military-Industrial Complex, a project of the American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Spend Billions on ABM's to Protect Obsolete ICBM's?

(Continued From Page One)

this lack of interest.

The second biggest item of future arms spending is the ABM. The Pentagon is beginning to leak stories designed to build up support for its escalation. Beecher reported in the *New York Times* Jan. 2, "Administration Expected to Back ABM Expansion." The Associated Press was given a similar backgrounder, "Soviet Buildup Spurs New Anti-Missile Plans" (*Washington Star,* Jan. 3). This was an effort to revive the first-strike scare of last spring. The AP was told that if the Russians continue building SS9s at the current rate, they will have 420 by 1974-75 and that these 420 would then be able to wipe out 95% of our 1,000 Minutemen in a surprise attack. The arithmetic sounds like pure Pentagon Munchhausen. Unanswered is the question of why anyone would risk a first strike at our Minutemen when this would expose the Soviet Union to destruction from our submarine missile fleet. Another question no one raised at the backgrounder was—if land based missiles are now so vulnerable to first attack, are they not obsolete? Indeed the House Appropriations Committee report on the new defense budget (Dec. 3, p. 78) suggests that instead of spending millions to bury the missiles in "very costly" hard rock siloes and in defending them with more ABMs, it would be better to replace them altogether with submarine or mobile land missiles. "The final argument for expansion," the AP account said, with unintended irony, "is that it would cost less now than later in the face of rising prices and inflation."

Seven Fold Rise in Two Decades

The House report noted that the fiscal 1969 military budget was 7 times the military budget of 1948, just two decades ago. It may easily double and redouble within the next ten years. The reductions in the 1970 budget were mostly cuts in fat and waste; old ships were mothballed, headquarter staffs—military and civilian—were cut down. Development contracts were stretched out. The budget cuts were a tactical retreat. In that retreat the Pentagon saved the major new weapons systems whose costs will proliferate into billions during the next decade. Senator Hatfield (*R. Ore.*) spelled out a few of them in his speech on final passage Dec. 15.

On Nixon's New Guru

I would like to correct the misunderstanding here on the part Sir Robert Thompson played in the Malayan war. Obviously he is a distinguished man, but he was not, as President Nixon would have it, one of the major architects of the victory in Malaya. They were in fact General Briggs and High Commissioner Gurney. The successful strategy in Malaya was known from the beginning as the Briggs Plan. Essentially it was a police action, and I do not believe it has much relevance in Vietnam. . . , I was a southeast Asian correspondent of The Times from 1951 to 1953, during which period I spent many months covering the Malayan war. I had the pleasure of meeting Sir Robert, and as I recall he was for the most of that period an assistant to the British Adviser in Johore. An important job, but not at the level where strategic decisions were made.

—Louis Heren, American Editor of the *London Times*, in a letter to the *Washington Post*, Dec. 25.

There was $100 million for AMSA, the new strategic bomber; it will eventually cost from $8 to $23 billion. The $450 million for the new F-14 plane launches a program that will cost from $15 to $30 billion. The $425 million for a new nuclear attack aircraft carrier will give us 15 such task forces eventually; each costs $1 billion. The $5 million for the new Navy underwater missile system (ULMS) in another item which will escalate into billions. These are but a few samples of the spiralling expenditures ahead.

Most important of all, despite talk of cutbacks, the new troop level strength next June will still be 3.2 million men, down only 260,000 from the previous June, and three quarters of a million men higher than in the first Kennedy year when the military buildup began. This huge force is the embodiment of a continued Pax Americana, "a projection of threats and contingencies," Hatfield said, "that are far overdrawn and bear little relation to the contemporary realities of international affairs." This year's appropriation though reduced somewhat still "allows us to station troops on foreign soil throughout the globe, where there mere presence often contributes more to the undermining of our relations with foreign nations than to our own security."

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, **The Hidden History of The Korean War** (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 1/12/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly, 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED